



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,418	01/05/2001	Jorge M. Ferreira	60001.0009US01	4805

27488 7590 05/07/2004
MERCHANT & GOULD
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DANG T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/755,418

Applicant(s)

FERREIRA ET AL.

Examiner

Dang T Nguyen

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 01/05/2001.
2. Claims 1 - 26, are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, 19, and 21 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1–6, 9-14, 16-21, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Grady et al. Pub. No.: US 2001/0056463 A1 with priority filed on 06/20/00.

Regarding independent claim 1, Fig. 4 Grady et al. discloses a method for removing personal information from the first electronic document (paragraph 0089 lines 1 – 3: disclosing personal document information web page Fig. 11 is displaying upon login) produced by a document generating application (paragraph 0080 lines 1 - 3 “user login screen”), wherein the method comprises the step of:

activating a privacy option (paragraph 0089 line 3 “user account login”) provided by the application (paragraph 0080 lines 1 - 3 “user login screen”), wherein activation of

the privacy option enables removal of one or more pieces of personal information from the first document (paragraph 0097 disclosing a web page document Fig. 11 having privacy option 226 which enable deleting a personal information 222 from the web page document of fig. 11) and (paragraph [0101]).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Grady et al. further discloses saving the first document (paragraph 0104 lines 1 – 13 *disclosing web page 11 with any personal information could be stored, [store is another term for “save”]*).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Grady et al. further discloses wherein the one or more pieces of personal information comprises an author's name, a user's name, a company name, a manager's name, a last saved by name, an e-mail address, or a combination thereof (paragraph [0101] discloses updating and changing personal information such as an e-mail address. Although, Grady et al. does not disclose "removing the e-mail address". However, removing or replacing is inherent for changing and updating taught by Grady et al.).

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 5, Grady et al. further discloses wherein the removal of one or more pieces of personal information from the first document comprises replacing the one or more pieces of personal information with generic information which is a string of letters, numbers, symbols, spaces, or a combination thereof (line 15 – 16 of paragraph 0092 *disclosing “RENAME” for renaming the name personal folder of personal web page document 11 and “rename” is another term for “replace”, and the generic information: string of letters, number, symbols, spaces are inherent to rename*).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Grady et al. further discloses wherein activation of the privacy option removes one or more pieces of personal information from the first document (paragraph [0097] discloses a web page document Fig. 11 having the privacy option link 226 which deletes the personal information link 222 from the document of Fig. 11).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Grady discloses a computing system containing at least one application module usable on the computing system, wherein the at least one application module comprises application code for performing the method of Claim 1 (paragraph 0017).

Regarding dependent claim 10, the claim incorporated substantially same subject matter as claim 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Fig. 4 Grady et al. discloses method for removing personal information from an electronic document (lines 1 – 3 of paragraph 0089 disclosing personal document information web page Fig. 11 is displaying upon login), wherein the method comprises the steps of: receiving input of one or more pieces of personal information into one or more data storage fields (paragraph 0080 lines 4 – 7, See Fig. 9) in response to a request for personal information (paragraph 0089 lines 1 – 3, for disclosing personal document information web page Fig. 11 is displaying upon login) from a document generating application (paragraph 0080 lines 1 - 3 “user login screen”); and receiving input to activate a privacy option for the document (Fig. 11 [170, and 224, and 226] and paragraph 0091 and paragraph 0097 for disclosing multiple privacy options); wherein activation of the privacy option enables

removal of the one or more pieces of personal information from the document (paragraph 0091 and 0097 disclosing multiple privacy options for delete personal files, and information on the web page document 11).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Grady et al. discloses wherein the one or more pieces of personal information comprises an author's name, a user's name, a company name, a manager's name, a last saved by name, an e-mail address, or a combination thereof (paragraph [0101] discloses updating and changing personal information such as an e-mail address. Although, Grady et al. does not disclose "removing the e-mail address". However, removing or replacing is inherent for changing and updating taught by Grady et al.).

Regarding dependent claims 13 and 14, the claims incorporated substantially same subject matter as claims 4, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Grady et al. further discloses receiving input (lines 6 – 7 of paragraph 0089) discloses multiples inputs Fig. 11 [168, 170, 172, 174, 176, 224, 226, 228]) to enter one or more pieces of new personal information into the document after activation of the privacy option (paragraph 0089), wherein the one or more pieces of new personal information into the document are (a) removed from the document (paragraph 0091, paragraph 0097, and paragraph 0101) or (b) replaced with generic information (1) as soon as the one or more pieces of new personal information are added to the document, or (2) as soon as an "OK" prompt is replied to by an user, or (3) as soon as the document is closed.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Grady et al. further discloses a computing system containing at least one application module usable on the computing system, wherein the at least one application module comprises application code for performing the method of Claim 11 (paragraph 0017).

Regarding dependent claim 18, the claim incorporated substantially same subject matter as claim 17, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 19, paragraph [0080] of Grady et al. discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions for performing a method (Fig. 10) for removing personal information from an electronic document (paragraph 0089), wherein the method comprises the steps of: activating a privacy option (paragraph 0089 line 3 "user account login") provided by the instructions (lines 4 – 7 of paragraph 0080 disclosing login account instructions 132, 134), wherein activation of the privacy option enables removal of one or more pieces of personal information from the document (paragraph 0097, *for disclosing a web page document Fig. 11 having privacy option 226 which enable deleting a personal information 222 from the document of fig. 11*).

Regarding dependent claim 20, Grady discloses wherein the method further comprises saving the document (paragraph 0104 lines 1 – 13 *disclosing web page 11 with any additional personal information could be stored, [store is another term for "save"]*).

Regarding dependent claim 21, Grady et al. discloses a method for removing personal information from an electronic document created (lines 1 – 3 of paragraph

0089 *disclosing personal document information web page 11 is displaying upon login*) by a document generating application (paragraph 0080 lines 1 - 3 "user login screen"), wherein the method comprises the steps of: providing a privacy option (Fig. 11 [168, 170, 172, 174, 224, 226, 228]); and receiving input to activate the privacy option (paragraphs 0090, 0091, 0092, and 0097); wherein activation of the privacy option enables removal of one or more pieces of personal information from the document (paragraphs 0097 and 0101) or replacement of one or more pieces of personal information with generic information.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Grady et al. further discloses comprising: providing a prompt to input instructions to activate the privacy option upon closing or saving the document (Col. 10 paragraph 0104, lines 12-14).

Regarding dependent claim 24, Grady et al. discloses wherein the personal information comprises at least one piece of personal information selected from an author's name, a user's name, a company name, a manager's name, a last saved by name, and an e-mail address (paragraph [0101] discloses updating and changing personal information such as an e-mail address. Although, Grady et al. does not disclose "removing the e-mail address". However, removing or replacing is inherent for changing and updating taught by Grady et al.).

Regarding dependent claim 25, Grady et al. further disclosing a computing system containing at least one application module usable on the computing system, wherein the at least one application module comprises application code for performing the method of Claim 21 (paragraph 0017).

Regarding dependent claim 26, the claim incorporated substantially same subject matter as claim 25, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 8, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grady et al., U.S. patent No. 6,275,824 B1 – Filed Oct. 2, 1998.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Grady et al. as applied to claim 2 discloses every aspect of applicant's claimed invention except for wherein saving the first document removes one or more pieces of personal information from the first document when the first document is saved.

However, "saving the first document.....saved", was well known to and well used for one ordinary skill in the art by function "save" which was used on well known document application software such as: internet browser, Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, Excel...etc...

Therefore, to save the information which has changing or removing or replacing in a saved document, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the function of "save" to save the removed or changed information from the saved document.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Grady et al. as applied to claim 1 disclosed every aspect of applicant's claimed invention except for creating a second template document from the first document.

However, creating a second template document from the first document was well known to and well used for one ordinary skill in the art by the function "Save as", which was used on well known document application software such as: internet browser, Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, Excel..etc...

Therefore, to provide time-saving feature and quickly generate a second template document having a same format as the first document, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the function of "Save as" to generate a second template document from the first document.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Grady et al. as applied to claim 11 disclosed every aspect of applicant's claimed invention except for saving the document removes the one or more pieces of personal information from the document with generic information.

However, receiving input to save the document, wherein saving the document removes or changes or replaces the personal information with generic information was well known to, and well used for by the fuction of "save", which was used on well known document application software such as: internet browser, Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, Excel...ect...

Therefore, to save the information which has changing or removing or replacing in a saved document, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the function of "save" to save the removed or changed information from the saved document.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Grady et al. as applied to claim 21 disclosed every aspect of applicant's claimed invention except for receiving input to save the document if the application has a save function.

However, receiving input to save the document was well known to and well used for one ordinary skill in the art by the fuction "save", which was used on well known document application software such as: internet browser, Microsoft Word, WordPerfect, Excel...etc...

Therefore, to receive input to save document if the application has a save function, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the function of "save" to save the document from the save function.

Prior art

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

O'Flaherty et al.	Patent No. 6,275,824 B1	Date of Patent: Aug. 14, 2001
Bunting et al.	Patent No. 6,629,843 B1	Date of Patent: Oct. 7, 2003

McDonough et al.	Patent No. 5,991,878	Date of Patent: Nov. 23, 1999
Markus et al.	Patent No. 6,490,601 B1	Date of Patent: Dec. 3, 2002

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Dang Nguyen, who can be reached by telephone at (703) 305-1673. Normal contact times are M-F, 8-4:30.

Upon an unsuccessful attempt to contact the examiner, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon may be reached at (703) 308-5186.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 746-7238 (for after-final communications)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to

Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive

Application/Control Number: 09/755,418

Page 12

Art Unit: 2178

Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (receptionist).

Dang Nguyen 4/29/2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sanjiv', with a stylized flourish at the end.

**SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER**